

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE

10/084,461

02/28/2002

Ki Cheong Yeung

016660-116

4990

7590

03/02/2004

EXAMINER RINEHART, KENNETH

James A. LaBarre BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

	•	
Application No.	Applicant(s)	17
10/084,461	YEUNG, KI CHEC	DNG MY
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenneth B Rinehart	3749	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Exam	ination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) [2 b) [The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	the final rejection.
have be 37 CFR (b) abov	706.07(f). Itensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136 en filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the filed is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the ve, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final reject patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	fee. The appropriate extension fee under ne final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the per 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal or	
2.🛛	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(с) Methey are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by mate issues for appeal; and/or	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) \square they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
	NOTE: see attached sheet.	
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a secanceling the non-allowable claim(s).	eparate, timely filed amendment
5.	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been consi application in condition for allowance because:	dered but does NOT place the
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY traised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	to issues which were newly
7.🖂	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided belo	
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
	Claim(s) allowed:	
	Claim(s) objected to: 7 and 20.	
	Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11-15, 19, 23-30,	
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8.	The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10.	Other:	
		Kenneth Rinehart Patent Examiner AU 3749

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Application/Control Number: 10/084,461

Art Unit: 3749

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the Russo patent does not anticipate either of claims 25 or 26. The examiner disagrees as claims in a pending application should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. The applicant has claimed that the holding assembly is located adjacent the first opening. The applicant believes that it is not unreasonable for the Russo embodiment to anticipate the claim language since the holding assembly is located adjacent the first opening. Adjacent is defined to mean nearby or not distant. The holding assembly of Russo is located nearby or not distant from the first opening. Regarding claims 11-13, the applicant is correct as the claims were intended to be included in the rejection under 35 USC 103. Regarding the features not disclosed, the applicant argues that the rejection does not form a proper basis for rejection under 35 USC 103. The examiner disagrees. It is the examiner's contention that it would have been obvious to an individual of ordinary skill in the art to use a substrate of ceramic or sponge material. The advantages outlined by the applicant the capability of being refilled and withstanding repeated heating and cooling cycles are possessed by the existing Russo invention. The Russo invention is presently capable of being refilled and it also possesses the property of being able to withstand repeated heating and cooling cycles.